

Marion County Public Schools

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: John Kerley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (87%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (88%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Madison Street Academy Of Visual And Performing Arts

401 NW MARTIN LUTHER KING JR AVE, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty, staff, parents, and business partners of Madison Street Academy of Visual and Performing Arts work together to provide a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Street Academy is committed to providing a quality learning environment that ensures success through the integration of the arts, academics, and technology.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kerley, John	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The employee in this position supervises all administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school and reports to the assigned administrator.
Smith, Mitzi	Assistant Principal	To aid the principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Stoddard, Angela	School Counselor	To coordinate a comprehensive school counseling program for all students leading to academic success, career awareness, social/personal development, community involvement and multicultural/global citizenship development.
Woods, Antron	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. Reports to principal and/or assistant principal and supervises assigned support staff.
Miller, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves specific identified school(s) as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content. Reports to assigned administrator.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/9/2019, John Kerley

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

448

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	71	70	74	77	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	17	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	1	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/11/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	71	72	75	75	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	69	71	72	75	75	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				94%	47%	57%	93%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				83%	56%	58%	75%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				88%	52%	53%	75%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				91%	51%	63%	97%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				85%	58%	62%	78%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				78%	49%	51%	74%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				93%	47%	53%	98%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	93%	44%	49%	58%	35%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	92%	49%	43%	58%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				
05	2021					
	2019	96%	45%	51%	56%	40%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	87%	49%	38%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	93%	54%	39%	64%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	93%	45%	48%	60%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-93%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	93%	44%	49%	53%	40%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25 / 35%	39 / 55%	56 / 78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 23%	9 / 35%	15 / 58%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 18%	21 / 30%	46 / 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 4%	4 / 15%	12 / 46%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	1 / 33%	1 / 33%
	English Language Learners	1 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34 / 49%	36 / 51%	50 / 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 18%	6 / 27%	15 / 68%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 100%	2 / 100%	2 / 100%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15 / 21%	15 / 21%	32 / 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2 / 9%	2 / 9%	5 / 23%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 50%	1 / 50%	2 / 100%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55 / 75%	44 / 60%	53 / 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 60%	12 / 48%	15 / 60%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 100%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19 / 26%	22 / 30%	47 / 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 24%	7 / 28%	13 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 25%
	English Language Learners	1 / 100%	1 / 100%	1 / 100%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41 / 55%	39 / 51%	50 / 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 43%	6 / 27%	9 / 41%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27 / 36%	29 / 38%	50 / 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 27%	5 / 23%	14 / 64%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59 / 74%	44 / 55%	52 / 66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 63%	8 / 33%	12 / 50%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52 / 65%	29 / 36%	52 / 67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13 / 54%	6 / 25%	12 / 52%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	70 / 88%	64 / 80%	63 / 80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 75%	14 / 58%	15 / 63%
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	72	86		76	73		59				
HSP	88	83		88	75		69				
MUL	91			91							
WHT	83	78		82	70	55	80				
FRL	71	90		79	64		65				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	77			85							
ASN	91			100							
BLK	84	83	88	76	71	70	78				
HSP	100	94		96	89						
MUL	100			100							
WHT	96	81	89	94	88	87	96				
FRL	87	83	79	87	81	75	81				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ASN	100	80		100	100						
BLK	81	65	67	86	65	64					
HSP	97	95		100	74		100				
MUL	92			100							
WHT	94	71	70	98	81	79	100				
FRL	85	67	65	94	74	68	93				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	73
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	81
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	74
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

When looking at FSA data, there has been a decline in the percent proficient for ELA, Math, and Science. ELA proficiency was 93% in 2018, 94% in 2019 and 83% in 2021. Math proficiency was 97% in 2018, 91% in 2019, and 83% in 2021. Science proficiency was 98% in 2018, 93% in 2019, and 77% in 2021.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

One area demonstrating a need for improvement was the drop in Science proficiency percentage of 16% from 2019 to 2021 (93% to 77%). Another area of concern was the third grade ELA proficiency percentage dropped 15% from 2019 to 2021 (93% to 78%). In Math, there was a 14% decrease in fourth grade math proficiency from 2019 to 2021 (93% to 79%). Progress monitoring data indicates that students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students lag behind grade level peers in Reading and math in grades 1 through 5. However data reflects the gap was closing from AP1 to AP3.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Face to Face Instructional loss for students between March-June of 2019, as well as for some students between August - June 2021. This disjointed instructional delivery no doubt had an impact of the level of proficiency of students. With all students in face to face instruction for the 2021-2022 school year as well as

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and state assessments, there was no improvement since 2019. However, MSA students exceed the district and state average in ELA, MA, and SCI in grades 3-5 as measured by 2021 FSA data.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

NA

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

After disaggregating 2021 student assessment data and evaluating trends, there will be a targeted focus on previewing upcoming standards, utilizing item specifications to assess the rigor and alignment of tasks and activities.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

In addition to weekly collaborative planning sessions, specific professional learning on 'designing coherent instruction' and 'content-specific critical reading' will be provided.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The addition of an Intervention Teacher/Coach will model effective planning and lessons with teachers based on need and evidence. Evidence will be determined through classroom observations as well as data tracking, utilizing progress monitoring data in the assessment periods. Assessment period data will also provide evidence of progress.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2021 FSA data for ELA, Math, and Science reveals a decline in the percentage of proficient students when compared to the 2019 data for all grades 3 through 5. This decline highlights the need to maximize instructional minutes by providing standards-aligned instruction.

There will be a specific focus on standards-aligned instruction across grade levels and subject areas. As a result, increases in proficiency level percentages in ELA, Math, and Science will result, as measured by 2022 FSA. Below are the specific measurable outcome goals.

Measurable Outcome:

3rd Grade:
ELA 15%
Math 3%

4th Grade:
ELA from 11%
Math 14%

5th Grade:
ELA 7%
Math 8%
Science 16%

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations as well as data tracking, utilizing progress monitoring data throughout assessment periods. Additionally, growth monitoring data for targeted students will also track individual student growth. Additionally coach and administrators will model and monitor implementation. Progress monitoring data will be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Direct Instruction, including lesson-design with a focus on standard-aligned instruction and tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on declining percentages of proficient students, a need to focus on direct Instruction, including lesson-design and a focus on standard-aligned instruction and tasks. By focusing on the interaction between the teacher, student, and content, teachers will gain a better understanding of what they are teaching and how to target instruction based on areas of student need. Tasks clearly aligned to the standards will result in more coherent and productive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

There will be a targeted focus on previewing upcoming standards, utilizing item specifications to assess the rigor, and alignment of tasks and activities.

Person Responsible John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Coach will model effective planning and lessons with teachers based on standards- alignment and tasks.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Miller (elizabeth.miller@marion.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	--

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2021 FSA data in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science reveals a decline in the percentage of proficient students when compared to the 2019 data for all grades 3 through 5. This decline highlights the need for the instructional leadership team to provide targeted professional learning to maximize instructional minutes and standards-aligned instruction.

If the leadership team provides targeted professional learning to maximize instructional minutes and standards-aligned instruction then increases in proficiency level percentages in ELA, Math, and Science will result, as measured by 2022 FSA.

3rd Grade:
ELA from 15%
Math 3%

Measurable Outcome: 4th Grade:
ELA from 11%
Math 14%

5th Grade:
ELA 7%
Math 8%
Science 16%

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored through classroom observations including a google document to track trends as well as a professional learning calendar for teachers to follow.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: John Kerley (john.kerley@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Leading teacher learning and development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A leadership team that leads and participates in teacher learning and development has been shown to have the greatest impact on student outcomes. (0.84)

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership will facilitate professional learning in lesson-design and a focus on standard-aligned instruction and tasks. Learning opportunities will include how to align instruction to create coherence, beginning with objective setting though student assessment.

Person Responsible Mitzi Smith (smith.mitzi@marion.k12.fl.us)

Leadership will facilitate professional learning in purpose setting, engaging, and analyzing lessons across a variety of subject areas. Participants will learn strategies to build lesson to assist students in moving from passive readers to active readers while deepening their understanding of the text they read.

Person Responsible Mitzi Smith (smith.mitzi@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Madison Street Academy employs a 'Culture of Service' to build a positive school culture and environment. The specifics of a Culture of Service are for each stakeholder within the school to ensure that those that they serve are equipped with all the tools, both tangible and intangible, as well as ensuring a safe and secure environment for them to perform their duties within their job responsibility in the most effective and efficient manner. For example, it is my job as the principal to provide to my administrative team a safe and secure work environment as well as all the tools they need to perform their duties. When these needs are met, each individual within this group is able to then provide the same to those that they serve. This pattern continues throughout the entire school's faculty and staff. This process ensures an ownership of each role within the school and autonomy to problem solve and troubleshoot potential issues or concerns. Ultimately, a 'Culture of Service' naturally builds a positive school culture and environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The principal provides leadership and direction for all aspects of the school's operation. Specific to promoting a positive culture and environment at the school, he will exercise proactive leadership in promoting a culture of service as well as the vision and mission of the school while providing recognition and celebration for student, staff, and school accomplishments. The assistant principal, dean, school counselor, intervention teacher, school secretary, receptionist, as well as all other faculty and staff assist the principal in these duties towards a culture of service.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00